

sending the number to the calling party based on the request.

---

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action, dated July 12, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by BARAL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,932,042); rejected claims 1-6, 9-16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over SALIMANDO (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,133) in view of BARAL et al.; and rejected claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over SALIMANDO in view of BARAL et al., and further in view of AOYAMA (U.S. Patent No. 5,119,415). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

By this amendment, claim 55 has been added. Claims 1-21 and 55 are pending.

At the outset, Applicants note that the Examiner failed to address independent claim 21 in the art rejections. Applicants, therefore, assume that this claim is allowable over the art of record. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by BARAL et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

BARAL et al. is directed to a voice and data messaging system. In BARAL et al., when a calling party receives a busy signal, the calling party may dial "\*867" to be connected to a Voice Message Operations Center for recording a voice message for the called party (Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention recited in independent claim 1, for example, includes a combination of features, including receiving a request from a calling party to

send a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, and sending the number in accordance with the request. Applicants respectfully submit that BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving a request from a calling party to send a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station. The Examiner relied on col. 3, lines 34-49 and 56-59, of BARAL et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 2).

Applicants submit that these sections of BARAL et al. do not disclose the recited feature.

Col. 3, lines 34-49, of BARAL et al. discloses:

The call is set up over local network 3 via toll network 5 to local network 7 for accessing called telephone 2. In toll network 5, the toll switch 10 is accessed from local network 3. The calling customer's number is forwarded from local network 3 via Automatic Number Identification (ANI) signals. Toll switch 10 sets up a connection over toll network 5 to local network 7 via toll switch 30. Called telephone 2 is then alerted. Assume that called telephone 2 is busy. The customer at calling telephone 1 hears the busy tone and keys the access code \*867 to access spontaneous voice messaging service for this call. In response to receiving the \*867, toll switch 10 disconnects the connection to toll switch 30 and instead initiates the establishment of a connection to toll switch 40 for accessing voice message operating center 50.

This section of BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving a request to send a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station to the first call station, but merely that a customer may connect to a voice messaging service by dialing \*867. Put another way, this section of BARAL et al. may disclose receiving a request for connection to a voice messaging service, but does not disclose or suggest

receiving a request to send a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station.

Col. 3, lines 56-59, of BARAL et al. discloses:

The VMOC announces the called number received in signaling message 60 to the calling customer in order to verify that a recorded message will be delivered to the proper destination.

This section of BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving a request to send a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station to the first call station, but merely that the Voice Messaging Operation Center (VMOC) can announce the called number to the calling party. This section of BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest that the VMOC receives a request to send a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station. Instead, BARAL et al.'s VMOC announces the called number in response to a request from the calling party to record a voice message (col. 3, lines 31-59).

BARAL et al. does not further disclose sending the number in accordance with the request. The Examiner relied on col. 3, lines 56-59, of BARAL et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 3). As noted above, BARAL et al. discloses that the VMOC announces the called number in response to a request from the calling party to record a voice message (col. 3, lines 31-59) and not, as recited in Applicants' claim 1, in response to a request to send a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that the reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly

taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Since, as set forth above, BARAL et al. does not disclose receiving a request from a calling party to send a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, or sending the number in accordance with the request, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by BARAL et al. is improper.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by BARAL et al.

Claim 11 recites features similar to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 11 is not anticipated by BARAL et al. for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 1-6, 9-16, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SALIMANDO in view of BARAL et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

SALIMANDO is directed to a system that announces the identity of the called party prior to call completion (Abstract).

Applicant submits that SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. For example, SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not disclose receiving a request from a calling party to send a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station. The Examiner relied on col. 3, lines 58-64, of SALIMANDO for allegedly disclosing sending a first call station a number sent from the

first call station and associated with a second call station (Office Action, pg. 4).

Applicants submit that SALIMANDO does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Col. 3, lines 58-64, of SALIMANDO discloses:

In step 124, announcement system 30 transmits the synthesized voice signals specific to called party 80 to calling party 70. The announcement typically identifies called party 80 and enhances the communication service by providing called party 80 ability to reduce the number of misdialled calls and preserving limited communication resources allocated to called party 80.

Applicants submit that this section of does not disclose sending a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, but merely that the announcement identifies the called party. As set forth at col. 5, lines 60-63, and col. 6, lines 1-8, of SALIMANDO, the identifying information includes the name of the company called (e.g., LL Bean) or the types of services provided by the called party. SALIMANDO does not disclose or suggest sending a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

SALIMANDO does not further disclose receiving a request for the number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station. The Examiner admitted that SALIMANDO does not disclose this feature and relied on the disclosure of BARAL et al. for allegedly disclosing receiving a request for the number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station (Office Action, pg. 4). As set forth in detail above, BARAL et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Applicants submit that SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not further disclose sending the number in accordance with the request, as also recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Since SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not disclose receiving a request from a calling party to send a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. cannot disclose sending a number in accordance with the request.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 2-6, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by the combination of SALIMANDO and BARAL et al.

For example, claim 3 recites sending a reconnect request to the first call station after the number is sent, receiving a response to the reconnect request, and sending a second call request to connect the first call station with the second call station. Applicants submit that SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not disclose this combination of features.

For example, SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not disclose or suggest sending a reconnect request to the first call station after the number is sent. The Examiner relied on col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 6, of SALIMANDO for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants submit that this section of SALIMANDO does not

disclose or suggest sending a reconnect request to the first call station after the number is sent.

Col., 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 6, of SALIMANDO discloses:

In step 126, switching system 20 starts a timer that has a predetermined period of waiting time. The waiting time provides calling party 70 an opportunity to respond to the announcement by either continuing to hold for a connection or disconnecting the call. For example, when the announcement identifies called party 80, calling party 70 determines whether the identified called party 80 is whom calling party 70 intends to call. Thereafter, calling party 70 either continues to hold or hangs up.

This section of SALIMANDO does not disclose or suggest sending a reconnect request to the first call station after the number is sent. To the contrary, this section of SALIMANDO keeps the first reconnect pending while waiting for the calling party to determine whether the call should continue.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 11 recites features similar to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 12-16, 19, and 20 depend from claim 11. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 11. Since claim 13 recites features similar to claim 3, Applicants submit that claim 13 is

further patentable over SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 3.

Claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over SALIMANDO in view of BARAL et al., and further in view of AOYAMA.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

AOYAMA is directed to a method for displaying information on a called party, such as the absence of the called party, on a calling terminal (Abstract and col. 2, lines 31-36).

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1 and claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 11. The disclosure of AOYAMA does not remedy the deficiencies set forth above with respect to the disclosures of SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 are patentable over SALIMANDO, BARAL et al., and AOYAMA, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 11. Moreover, these claims are patentable over SALIMANDO, BARAL et al., and AOYAMA for reasons of their own.

For example, claims 7 and 17 recite that the first call station is associated with a display device and the sending includes sending the number to the display device. The Examiner admitted that SALIMANDO and BARAL et al. do not disclose these features and relied on col. 3, lines 59-63, Fig. 9, and col. 8, lines 10-29, of AOYAMA for allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 7). Applicants submit that these sections of AOYAMA do not disclose or suggest the recited features.

Col. 3, lines 56-65, of AOYAMA discloses:



FIG. 7 shows the format of an unsuccessful backward set-up information message (EMU) added with extended information according to the present invention;

FIGS. 8 and 11 are sequential diagrams showing other embodiments of this invention;

FIG. 9 shows a display example;

FIG. 10 shows a table for use in selecting either an actual call or a circuit release in accordance with the called party circumstances;

This section of AOYAMA does not disclose or suggest a first call station being associated with a display device or that the sending includes sending the number to the display device. In fact, this section of AOYAMA is in no way related to the recited features.

Fig. 9 of AOYAMA illustrates a display screen that may be presented to a calling party. AOYAMA does not disclose or suggest that the display screen displays the number of the second call station to the first call station.

Col. 8, lines 10-29, of AOYAMA discloses:

The name, office department and the circuit of a user of the called party terminal may be registered in the message text. A brief explanation of the CCITT Recommendation field will be given. The H.sub.0 (Header 0) field indicates that a heading code is represented by H.sub.0, and the H.sub.1 (Header 1) field indicates that a heading code is represented by H.sub.1. The inter-network call information display field is made of one byte, the bits A to G being used as a spare, and the bit H being used for indicating whether there is inter-network call information. The terminal number digit field is made of one byte to represent the number of digits of the terminal number (extension number). The terminal number field is made of three bytes to represent the terminal number (extension number). The terminal number digit field and terminal number field are specific to FAI

Upon reception of FAI with the called party information added thereto, the calling party terminal can display the called party information without actually accessing the called party terminal.

This section of AOYAMA does not disclose or suggest the display of a number associated with a second call station, but merely that a terminal number may be displayed.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 17 are patentable over SALIMANDO, BARAL et al., and AOYAMA, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

New claim 55 recites receiving a call connection request from a calling party to a called party, receiving a request from the calling party to send a number associated with the called party to the calling party while the call is being connected, terminating the call connection, and sending the number to the calling party based on the request. Applicants submit that SALIMANDO, BARAL et al., and AOYAMA, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 13-2491 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectively submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 

John E. Harrity

Registration No. 43,367

Date: October 10, 2002

11240 Waples Mill Road  
Suite 300  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800